UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,777	12/29/2003	Raymond J. Hodnett	90222-00003	8219

7590 07/17/2006

Ralph W. Selitto, Jr.
McCarter & English
Four Gateway Center
100 Mulberry Street
Newark, NJ 07102

EXAMINER	
DARNO, PATRICK A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,777	HODNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick A. Darno	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 23, 24, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to claim 23, the claim is rejected because there is no description in the specification that clearly specifies the method step of "the engineer introducing the GIS to the municipality" in sufficient detail in order to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method claimed. Without a specific description of the method steps involved in "introducing the GIS to the municipality", it is not known to one of ordinary skill in the art exactly what method steps are involved in this process. Appropriate correction is required.

With respect to claim 24, the claim is rejected because there is no description in the specification that clearly specifies the method step of "the engineer teaching the municipality to use the GIS" in sufficient detail in order to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method claimed. Without a specific description of the method steps

involved in the "teaching the municipality to use the GIS" it is not known to one of ordinary skill in the art exactly what method steps are involved in this process. Appropriate correction is required.

With respect to claim 35, the claim is rejected because there is no description in the specification that clearly specifies how "related data", which is stored in a database, can be updated without the use of a computer. It is unknown to one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and use an invention that provides for updating data stored in a database without the use of a computer. Since the specification does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, the claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, firs paragraph. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,542,813 issued to Erno Kovacs (hereinafter "Kovacs").

Claim 1:

Kovacs discloses a system for presenting a GIS, comprising:

(A) a database containing map data and related data, said related data linked to said map data (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16);

(B) a server computer running GIS software for presenting the map data and the related data, said server having access to data in said database , and connected to the Internet (Kovacs: column 5, lines 21-24 and column 5, lines 32-35 and column 1, lines 26-31);

(C) means for updating said related data (Kovacs: column 5, lines 58-64 and Fig. 4; Note specifically the 'updater' module in Fig. 4.).

Claim 12:

Kovacs discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kovacs further discloses wherein said related data in said database is subject to searching based upon search terms (Kovacs: column 1, lines 39-41).

Claim 13:

Kovacs discloses all the elements of claim 12, as noted above, and Kovacs further discloses wherein the searching conducted may combine search terms for a plurality of data fields (Kovacs: column 1, lines 39-41; Combining search terms for a plurality of databases is a well known in querying databases.).

Claim 14:

Kovacs discloses all the elements of claim 12, as noted above, and Kovacs further discloses wherein said related data is displayable in text or map form (Kovacs: Fig. 1 clearly shows data being displayed in both map and text form.).

Claim 15:

Kovacs discloses all the elements of claim 12, as noted above, and Kovacs further discloses wherein said related data pertaining to a parcel of property can be accessed by selecting the parcel from the graphical map interface or by selecting a municipal department having responsibility for processing forms containing said related data sought (Kovacs: column 2, lines 25-28; This clearly shows that an icon can represent data on a map and that the icon (or parcel) can be selected on the map to display further related data.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,815,417 issued to Wilson W. Orr et al. (hereinafter "Orr").

Claim 2:

Kovacs discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, but Kovacs does not explicitly disclose wherein said map data pertains to a political unit and said related data pertains to governmental functions conducted by said political unit.

However, Orr discloses wherein said map data pertains to a political unit and said related data pertains to governmental functions conducted by said political unit (Orr:

column 6, lines 4-7 and column 6, lines 24-28; The maps in the Orr reference can assist a political unit (municipality), so the map data provided by the GIS must pertain to the actual municipality (political unit). Further, the governmental functions conducted by the political unit (municipality) include police power (Orr: column 6, lines 4-7) and tax information (Orr: column 9, lines 35-38).).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kovacs with the teachings of Orr noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Kovacs noted above for the purpose of assisting a municipality in developing long term strategies that integrate environmental trends and emerging guidelines for development (Orr: column 6, lines 24-28).

Claim 3:

The combination of Kovacs and Orr discloses all the elements of claim 2, as noted above, and Orr further discloses wherein said political unit is in the nature of a municipality and said governmental functions include public service, public works, taxing, and police power (Orr: column 6, lines 4-7 and column 6, lines 24-28; The maps in the Orr reference can assist a political unit (municipality), so the map data provided by the GIS must pertain to the actual municipality (political unit). Further, the governmental functions conducted by the political unit (municipality) include police power (Orr: column 6, lines 4-7) and tax information (Orr: column 9, lines 35-38).).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view Orr and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0049345 issued to James G. McDonough et al. (hereinafter "McDonough").

Claim 4:

The combination of Kovacs and Orr discloses all the elements of claim 3, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein said governmental functions utilize forms for obtaining, storing and reporting data, said related data including data derived from said forms.

However, McDonough explicitly discloses wherein said governmental functions utilize forms for obtaining, storing and reporting data, said related data including data derived from said forms (McDonough: paragraph [0144]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with teachings of McDonough noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above in order to submit new data to the GIS database when a new situation or development arises (McDonough: paragraph [0144]).

6. Claims 5-11 and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view Orr in view of McDonough and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0067482 issued to Daniel Huong-Yu Wu et al. (hereinafter "Wu").

Claim 5:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 4, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein said means for updating includes computer processing apparatus and

software for converting faxed forms into said related data having a digital value corresponding to an actual value.

However, Wu discloses wherein said means for updating includes computer processing apparatus and software for converting faxed forms into said related data having a digital value corresponding to an actual value (Wu: paragraph [0002] and paragraph [0048], lines 12-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Wu noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the related data can be retrieved from a file automatically using known computerized recognition technologies (Wu: paragraph [0006], lines 1-5).

Claim 6:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 5, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein said computer processing apparatus includes first means for converting a faxed form into an image file and second means for extracting said related data from said image file (Wu: paragraph [0002] and paragraph [0048], lines 12-19).

Claim 7:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 6, and Wu further discloses wherein said second means for extracting include means for recognizing data fields in said image file and means for converting the data

fields into digital values by at least one of optical character recognition and intelligent character recognition (Wu: paragraph [0006] and paragraph [0015]).

Claim 8:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 7, and Wu further discloses wherein said means for updating include a fax machine from which a form bearing written data is sent as faxed data and a fax receiver that receives and converts the fax data into said image file (Wu: paragraph [0002] and paragraph [0048], lines 12-19; Note specifically that the fax is converted into a TIFF image.).

Claim 9:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 8, and Wu further discloses wherein said image file is in at least one of tiff, jpg, png, pdf, and gif formats (Wu: paragraph [0002] and paragraph [0048], lines 12-19; Note specifically that the fax is converted into a TIFF image.).

Claim 10:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 9, and Wu further discloses including visual comparison means for presenting the image file and the data values derived therefrom to a human receiver to allow verification that the data was converted correctly (Wu: paragraph [0013], lines 4-8 and paragraph [0039], lines 19-21; Wu clearly discloses checking the validity of a conversion of a document that was scanned. The second reference clearly shows a manual comparison by a human user.).

Claim 11:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 10, and Kovacs further discloses including a data server for serving said database to said server computer for transmission of the related data over the Internet (Kovacs: column 5, lines 21-31).

Claim 31:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein said means for updating including a digital sender for communicating related data into the database (Wu: paragraph [0020], lines 6-9; Note specifically 'data delivery'. Delivering data to a database must include a sender to send or delivery the data to the database.).

Claim 32:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 10, as noted above, and Wu further discloses including digital comparison means for conducting a data parity check to allow verification that the data was converted correctly (Wu: paragraph [0013] and paragraph [0020], lines 6-9; Note specifically that Wu's invention performs 'data verification'. This would involve some form of digital comparison.).

Claim 33:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 10, as noted above, and Wu further discloses including means for grouping related image files into the batches to facilitate verification that the data was converted correctly (Wu: paragraph [0013] and paragraph [0020], lines 6-9 and paragraph [0039]; Note

specifically that Wu's invention performs 'data verification'. It should be noted that batch processing is extremely well known in the art.).

Claim 34:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein said means for updating include means for communicating related data in the form of a previously scanned document into the database (Wu: paragraph [0020], lines 6-9; Note specifically 'data delivery'.).

Claim 36:

The combination of Kovacs, Orr, McDonough, and Wu discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein said second means for extracting include means for recognizing data fields in said image file and means for converting the data fields into digital values by intelligent character recognition (Wu: paragraph [0006] and paragraph [0015]).

7. Claims 16-17 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0085133 issued to Gary Neal Young et al. (hereinafter "Young").

Claim 16:

Kovacs discloses a method for developing a GIS, comprising the steps of:

(A) providing a database structure for containing map data and related data linked to said map data (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16);

(B) providing a server computer running GIS software for presenting the map data and the related data, said server computer having access to data in said database, and connected to the Internet (Kovacs: column 5, lines 21-24 and column 5, lines 32-35 and column 1, lines 26-31; Note specifically the GIS database that is kept on a server.);

(C) creating at least one map of geographic area and storing it in the database (Kovacs: column 6, lines 16-20);

(D) storing related data associated with the geographical area depicted in the at least one map in the database (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16);

(E) linking the map to the associated data (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16); and

(F) providing the GIS to users over the Internet (Kovacs: column 1, lines 26-31).

Kovacs does not explicitly disclose:

(G) charging fees to the users of municipal services for data change transactions that effect the related data in the database.

However, Young discloses:

(G) charging fees to the users of municipal services for data change transactions that effect the related data in the database (Young: paragraph [0132]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kovacs with the teachings of Young noted above for the purpose of charging a user to access or interact with information (Young: paragraph [0132], lines 1-3). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to

improve the teachings of Kovacs per the above such that charging a fee for information could help control how much information is distributed and how often information is distributed.

Claim 17:

The combination of Kovacs and Young discloses all the elements of claim 16, as noted above, and Young further discloses wherein the database structure, the server computer and the GIS is owned by a system owner and the data change transactions are associated with municipal transactions between a municipality and an entity seeking municipal services, said entity paying a fee to the municipality in response to said step of charging (Young: paragraphs [0132], [0133] and paragraph [0143], lines 3-7 and paragraph [0146], lines 12-15; Note the reference to paragraph [0146] that shows that the service provider or source of information is a municipality. The rest of the references clearly disclose charging a fee for data transactions (access or interaction with data). This fee is paid to the provider of the data (municipality).).

Claims 37:

Kovacs discloses a method for developing a GIS, comprising the steps of:

(A) providing a database structure for containing map data and related data linked to said map data (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16);

(B) providing a server computer running GIS software for presenting the map data and the related data, said server computer having access to data in said database, and connected to the Internet (Kovacs: column 5, lines 21-24 and column 5, lines 32-35 and column 1, lines 26-31; Note specifically the GIS database that is kept on a server.);

(C) creating at least one map of a geographic area and storing it in the database (Kovacs: column 6, lines 16-20);

(D) storing related data associated with the geographical area depicted in the at least one map in the database (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16);

(E) linking the map to the associated data (Kovacs: column 2, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 53-57 and column 5, lines 11-16); and

(F) providing the GIS to users over the Internet (Kovacs: column 1, lines 26-31).

Kovacs does not explicitly disclose:

(G) charging the users of the GIS for viewing data in the database.

However, Young discloses:

(G) charging the users of the GIS for viewing data in the database (Young: paragraph [0132]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kovacs with the teachings of Young noted above for the purpose of charging a user to access or interact with information (Young: paragraph [0132], lines 1-3). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Kovacs per the above such that charging a fee for information could help control how much information is distributed and how often information is distributed.

Claim 38:

The combination of Kovacs and Young discloses all the elements of claim 37, as noted above, and Young further discloses wherein the step of charging fees is triggered when data is viewed pursuant to a data change transaction (Young: paragraph [0133]; Note that users actions are monitored and then the user is billed appropriately.).

Claim 39:

The combination of Kovacs and Young discloses all the elements of claim 38, as noted above, and Young further discloses wherein the step of charging fees is conducted in advance of the data change transaction based upon an estimated volume of data change transactions (Young: paragraphs: [0132] and [0143]; Note specifically in paragraph [0143] that the charging or billing of the user must happen in advance because when the user is billed or charged, the system also checks for delinquencies which could limit the users access to the data.).

8. Claims 18-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of Young and in further view of McDonough.

Claim 18:

The combination of Kovacs and Young discloses all the elements of claim 17, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the data change transaction includes the submission of change data by the entity to the municipality.

However, McDonough discloses wherein the data change transaction includes the submission of change data by the entity to the municipality (McDonough: paragraph [0144]; The submission of the form changes the data stored for a given location.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with teachings of McDonough noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above in order to submit new data to the GIS database when a new situation or development arises (McDonough: paragraph [0144]).

Claim 19:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 18, as noted above, and McDonough further discloses wherein the change data is presented on a written form (McDonough: paragraph [0144]; Note that the update is submitted in text or written form as opposed to a video or audio update.).

Claim 20:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 19, as noted above, and Young further discloses wherein the written form is selected from the group consisting of building applications, building subcode, certificate applications, certificates, inspection schedules, inspection scheduling, rental inspection, rental testing, rental unit registration, UCCARS submission, Uniform Construction Code submission, oil spill forms, septic system forms, well permits, planning board applications, Planning/Zoning inspection scheduling, site plan applications, subdivision applications, violations/complaints, zoning board applications, zoning permits, zoning tracking, dog licenses, accident reports, crime data, refuse pickup, tax information, application denial, application for appeal, application for zoning permit, plan review, fire inspections, rental unit updates, document bundles, pocket PC inspections,

DARM/OPRA, street opening permits, and utility work orders (Young: abstract; The system presented by Young maps utility systems using a GIS. The data submitted and retrieved from the utility mapping system database contains at least utility work orders (Young: paragraph [0146], 12-15). Once one can retrieve one type of form, it is obvious how to retrieve the same type of form that simply contains different content. Furthermore, note again that the utility documents are in text or written form as opposed to video or audio form.).

Claim 21:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 17, as noted above, and Young further discloses the step of the municipality paying a fee to the system owner for data change transactions (Young: paragraphs [0132], [0133] and paragraph [0143], lines 3-7; Note that a fee is charged for all data access and data interaction.).

Claim 22:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 17, as noted above, and Young further discloses the step of an engineer purchasing a license from the system owner to use the GIS (Young: paragraphs [0132], [0133] and paragraph [0143], lines 3-7; Note that a fee is charged for all data access and data interaction. By paying a fee to interact with the data, one is effectively purchasing a license for the data.).

Claim 25:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 22, and Young further discloses the step of the engineer offering use of the GIS to the municipality free of charge, except for the payment of fees associated with data

change transactions (Young: paragraphs [0132], [0133] and paragraph [0143], lines 3-7; Note that fees are only charged for access to data or interaction with data (data transactions).).

Claim 30:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 22, as noted above, and Young further discloses comprising the step of the system owner licensing the municipality to use the database (Young: paragraphs [0132], [0133] and paragraph [0143], lines 3-7; Note that a fee is charged for all data access and data interaction. By paying a fee to interact with the data, one is effectively purchasing a license for the data.).

9. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of Young in view of McDonough and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20050078110 issued to John M. Lewis et al. (hereinafter "Lewis").

Claim 26:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, and McDonough discloses all the elements of claim 22, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose the step of the engineer making maps for incorporation into the GIS.

However, Lewis discloses the step of the engineer making maps for incorporation into the GIS (Lewis: paragraphs [0016], [0017] and [0019]; Paragraphs [0016] and [0017] show that both CAD and GIS applications include maps created by a user. Paragraph [0019] shows that the combination of CAD and GIS allows engineers to create models for precision engineering tasks. Since both CAD and GIS contain maps, and the civil engineer creates CAD and GIS projects, the civil engineer must be creating maps.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that a trained professional would be responsible for submitting maps to the GIS system.

Claim 27:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, McDonough, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 26, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses the step of the system owner receiving the maps made by the engineer and paying the engineer a map-making fee (Lewis: paragraphs [0016], [0017] and [0019]; The cited references do not say that the engineer 'volunteered' to make the maps. Since engineers are professionals, it is obvious that he engineer was paid to perform his/her task.).

Claim 28:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, McDonough, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 27, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses the step of the engineer preparing updates for the maps provided (Lewis: paragraph [0026]; This reference shows that the engineer can edit or update surfaces of existing maps.).

Claim 29:

The combination of Kovacs, Young, McDonough, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 22, and Kovacs further comprising the step of the system owner modifying the database to accommodate new types of related data associated with new

forms serviced by the GIS after the step of providing a database structure (Kovacs: column 1, lines 45-55).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick A. Darno whose telephone number is (571) 272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PD

DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Patrick A. Darno
Examiner
Art Unit 2163